

February 6, 1997

Dear Sir or Madam:

With this letter, we are transmitting summaries of the Consumer Products Working Group (CPWG) meeting, the Reactivity Subgroup meeting, the Enforcement Policy Workshop, and the Mid-term Measures Workshop which were held on October 29 and 30, 1996, in Sacramento, California. We have also enclosed a copy of the attendance list for the meetings.

On October 29, the meetings began with the fourth semi-annual meeting of the CPWG. This was followed by the fifth meeting of the Reactivity Subgroup. In the afternoon, the first Consumer Products Enforcement Policy Workshop was held. On October 30, a second workshop to discuss the development of the mid-term measures was held. Attendees included representatives from other governmental agencies, manufacturers, trade associations, retailers, environmental groups, and local air pollution control districts.

If you have any questions about the CPWG meeting, please call Ms. Doris Rausch, Implementation Section, at (916) 327-1529. If you need information on the Reactivity Subgroup meeting, contact Mr. Floyd Vergara, Technical Evaluation Section, at (916) 327-1503. For questions on the Enforcement Policy Workshop, please call Mr. Charles Beddow, Manager, Field Enforcement Section, Compliance Division, at (916) 322-6033. With regard to questions or information on the Mid-term Measures Workshop, contact Mr. Paul Milkey at (916) 327-1517, or Ms. Lisa Kasper at (916) 327-0648, of the Measures Development Section.

Sincerely,

Genevieve A. Shiroma, Chief  
Air Quality Measures Branch

Enclosures

cc: Ms. Doris Rausch (w/Enclosures)  
Implementation Section  
Stationary Source Division

Mr. Floyd Vergara (w/Enclosures)  
Technical Evaluation Section  
Stationary Source Division

Mr. Charles Beddow (w/Enclosures)  
Manager, Field Enforcement Section  
Compliance Division

Mr. Paul Milkey (w/Enclosures)  
Measures Development Section  
Stationary Source Division

Ms. Lisa Kasper (w/Enclosures)  
Measures Development Section  
Stationary Source Division

Consumer Products Working Group  
Fourth Meeting Summary - October 29, 1996

Introduction

The fourth semi-annual meeting of the Consumer Products Working Group (CPWG) was held on October 29, 1996, at the Sacramento Convention Center in Sacramento, California. There were approximately 115 participants. The following items were presented at the meeting:

1. Status Reports

November Board Hearing  
AB 1849 Legislative Update  
Hairspray Technical Assessment  
Antiperspirants and Deodorants  
Aerosol Coatings  
Special Recognition Labeling for Aerosol Coatings

2. Update on State Implementation Plan (SIP) Progress and Inventory and Modeling

3. Research Contracts

4. Summary of Method 310

Summary

The ARB staff updated the CPWG members on the status of the ongoing consumer products activities. Following an update on the California SIP, the question was asked if there would be a revision to the SIP in 1997. Staff explained that there were no plans for revising the SIP in 1997.

Staff from the Technical Support Division gave a presentation on photochemical modeling. The Urban Airshed Model was used to simulate the impacts of consumer product emissions on peak ozone and population exposure for the

South Coast Air Basin. The simulations were for the South Coast Air Basin for August 26 - 28, 1987, and used emissions and meteorology from the 1994 SIP. These simulations showed that consumer product emissions are about 60 percent as effective in reducing peak ozone as motor vehicle emissions per ton of volatile organic compounds (VOC) emitted. Reductions of population exposure to ozone concentrations above 9 pphm were the same for consumer products as for motor vehicle VOC per ton of VOC emitted.

The Monitoring and Laboratory Division staff presented a summary of draft Method 310. The proposed amendments to the Test Methods Sections of the Antiperspirant and Deodorants, Consumer Products, and the Aerosol Coating Products regulations were approved at the November Board Hearing. These amendments reference Method 310 as the method for determining compliance with the applicable VOC emission standards. In response to public comments, we agreed to remove all test procedures for determining low vapor pressure compounds (LVP). The LVP procedures are deferred currently to allow more time for the ARB staff to work with industry representatives to resolve the LVP issue. We also agreed to include in the regulations the method's "step by step process" which deals with how results are used for compliance determination and to add language in the resolution stating that the staff will report to the Board in six months and annually thereafter for a minimum of three years on the implementation of Method 310. The public will have an opportunity to review and provide comments on these changes when the public comment period is opened for 15 days. The 15 day package will be available for comment in early 1997. After considering the public comments received from the initial 45 day period and subsequent 15 day period, the regulatory package will be submitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) for approval. The amendments will become final in 1997 after OAL approval.

In response to a question as to whether other laboratories outside of the state can analyze consumer products for VOC content, staff explained that Method 310 is a compliance determination procedure for use by the ARB. However, affected industry may wish to contract with an outside laboratory to run Method 310 to provide some measure of assurance their product will comply.

#### Future Meetings

A joint meeting of the Mid-term Measures Workshop and Reactivity Subgroup is scheduled for February 4, 1997.

The next meeting of the CPWG is tentatively scheduled for May 1997.

Inquiries about this meeting summary should be directed to Doris Rausch, Air Resources Board, at (916) 327-1529.

Reactivity Subgroup  
Fifth Meeting Summary - October 29, 1996

Introduction

On October 29, 1996, the fifth meeting of the Reactivity Subgroup was held at the Sacramento Convention Center in Sacramento, California. There were 115 participants. The following items were presented at the meeting:

1. Results of the Reactivity Pilot Project
2. Draft Concept Paper for Consumer-products Low Emissions and Reactivity (CLEAR) Pilot Program
3. CSMA/CMA Comments on Guiding Principles
4. Future Activities

Summary

Reactivity Pilot Project

- ☐ ARB staff presented and discussed results of the recently-conducted reactivity pilot project. The reactivity pilot project was voluntary and provided an opportunity for participating manufacturers to try, on both a hypothetical and actual bench-scale/production basis, reformulations using the preliminary reactivity-based control concepts discussed to date. The pilot project, which involved four participating manufacturers, yielded results that suggest the reactivity program has the potential to achieve significant reductions in ozone; it also suggests some factors the Reactivity Subgroup should keep in mind during the development of the reactivity program. The results from the participating companies were as follows:
  - 1) One company achieved significant reductions (approx. 9 tons/yr and 1 ton/yr in ozone formation potential, or 33% and 26% reductions relative to pre-reformulation ozone formation potential, respectively) by replacing certain ingredients in two products with acetone and other less-reactive compounds.
  - 2) Another company evaluated the reactivity of a variety of their products and found that the reactivities of their products do not necessarily correlate with VOC content. That is, they found products with high VOC content and low reactivities, low VOC content and high reactivities, and other combinations. They found a similar lack of direct correlation between the relative efficacy of products with their VOC contents and reactivities (e.g., three products with essentially equivalent VOC contents had reactivities ranging from 1.4 to 3.2 and relative

efficacies of "Good," "Better," and "Best."

- 3) One company developed its own proposal for a reactivity-based "Innovative Product" provision; the proposal is under consideration by ARB staff and the subgroup.
- 4) Reformulations with regard to reactivity should account for other factors which may be of equal or greater significance to companies, including flammability, toxicity, and solubility.

#### Consumer-products Low Emissions and Reactivity (CLEAR) Pilot Program

Staff introduced a draft concept paper for the CLEAR pilot program. To facilitate further discussions, the staff developed a concept paper that suggests the main elements to consider in a reactivity-based program, as follows:

- 1) The CLEAR program would be voluntary at this time;
- 2) Main definitions needed would be "CLEAR Content" (reactivity-adjusted VOC content) and "CLEAR Limit" (reactivity-adjusted VOC limit);
- 3) A methodology that could be used to develop CLEAR Limits was proposed, as well as a variety of exemptions;
- 4) Staff also proposed a "two-bin" system for classifying and determining reactivity values for individual VOCs; a "default reactivity" for VOCs without an assigned reactivity value was also proposed for discussion.

#### Future Meetings

- ☐ The Reactivity Subgroup will no longer be meeting apart from the Mid-term Measures Subgroup, but instead will be holding joint meetings with the Mid-term Measures Subgroup. The next meeting of the Reactivity Subgroup is February 4, 1997, in conjunction with the Mid-term Measures Workshop.

Enforcement Policy Workshop  
October 29, 1996

#### Introduction

On October 29, 1996, the California Air Resources Board, Compliance Division held the Enforcement Policy Workshop, at the Sacramento Convention Center. There were approximately 110 participants. The following items were presented at the meeting:

1. Opening Remarks - John Dunlap, Chairman (ARB)
2. Legal Overview - Kathleen Walsh, Chief Legal Counsel (ARB)
3. Overview Business Outreach Program - Jim Schoning, Ombudsman (ARB)
4. The Consumer Products Program - Genevieve A. Shiroma, Chief, Air Quality Measures Branch (ARB):
  - Overview of Consumer Products Program
  - Mid-term Measures Development
  - Upcoming Events
  - Looking Ahead
5. Enforcement Policy for the Consumer Products Regulation - James J. Morgester, Chief, Compliance Division (ARB):
  - Enforcement Program Goals
  - Mechanisms for Compliance
  - Enforcement Process
  - Responsible Party
  - Incentives for Self-Evaluation

#### Summary

The Enforcement Workshop was designed to provide retailers with a simplified summary of the Consumer Products regulation so that they may better understand the law and learn how they can benefit from compliance. Included in the workshop was an explanation of the California Environmental Protection Agency's (Cal/EPA) policy on environmental auditing and voluntary disclosure. The ARB plans to use this policy for conducting enforcement action against sources that are directly regulated by this agency. The subject policy refers to violations which are discovered through a self-audit process and voluntarily disclosed to ARB.

Copies of the Enforcement Workshop presentation or copies of the Cal/EPA Policy On Incentives For Self-Evaluation can be requested by writing to Mr. Morgester at the address indicated below or requesting a copy through the Internet.

Contact: James J. Morgester, Chief  
Compliance Division  
Air Resources Board  
P.O. Box 2815  
Sacramento, CA 95812  
(916) 322-6022

E-mail: [jmorgest@arb.ca.gov](mailto:jmorgest@arb.ca.gov)

Inquiries about this meeting summary should be directed to Paula Barraza, Air Resources Board, at (916) 445-0160.

Mid-term Measures Workshop  
Second Workshop Summary - October 30, 1996

### Introduction

On October 30, 1996, the second Mid-term Measures Workshop was held at the Sacramento Convention Center in Sacramento, California. The following items were presented at the workshop:

1. A discussion of the preliminary results of the Mid-term Measures 1994/1995 Consumer Products Survey.
2. An explanation of the maximum incremental reactivity (MIR) values used for prioritization of product categories.
3. An explanation of how we prioritized the product categories included in the survey for future consideration in the mid-term measures.

### Summary

During the workshop, Air Resources Board staff provided an explanation of the tables contained in the preliminary Consumer Products Mid-term Measures Data Summaries that were mailed to the consumer products mailing list prior to the workshop. We also noted that we expect the emission estimates to increase as additional surveys are collected and added to the survey database.

Staff also provided an explanation of the MIR values used to prioritize the product categories included in our survey. During the workshop, several comments were made regarding the MIR values for petroleum distillate mixtures. Participants at the workshop also noted that some Low Vapor Pressure (LVP) compounds were found in the volatile organic compound tables for each product category. Staff will work closely with the trade associations and industry representatives to clarify and resolve these issues. Finally, we discussed our criteria and rationale for prioritizing the categories we surveyed. This prioritization was yet another level of screening we used to determine which categories have the most potential for emission reductions.

Based on comments received at and subsequent to the workshop, we have decided to initially focus on 21 categories (encompassing 29 of the categories surveyed) for the mid-term measures. This will provide us additional time to evaluate studies on health benefit products, soap products containing volatile organic compounds which may not all be emitted to the atmosphere due to partial biodegradation in the sewer system (down-the-drain issue), and solvent products such as multi-purpose solvent. We also modified how some of the product categories were grouped based on similarities in product function. For example, we grouped the Tire Cleaner/Dressing category with the Rubber and Vinyl Protectant category because

these products have similar functions and formulations. We are reconsidering the Rubber and Vinyl Protectant category because we discovered that a data entry error resulted in an underestimation of its emissions. It should be noted that five of the 21 product categories, shown with asterisks, include some product categories that we initially split up for purposes of the survey. After reviewing our survey data we thought it was appropriate to move some of the smaller product categories, with lower ozone formation potential, into larger product categories that have similar products. We recognize that the related product categories included in these larger categories are not identical, and that the same standard or control strategy may not be appropriate for all of the related categories. Therefore, as we investigate them further, we will consider the different product forms, formulations and emission reduction potentials in proposing standards.

Enclosed are the results of our preliminary prioritization of the product categories surveyed including: 1) categories that we are initially focusing on for the mid-term measures; 2) categories that we grouped together; and 3) categories that require further study.

#### Future Meetings

We released the complete survey results in December 1996. We are holding scoping meetings with industry representatives in December 1996 and January 1997 to discuss the potential for developing technologically and commercially feasible standards. The proposed schedule for developing the mid-term measures is shown below.

#### Proposed Schedule for Developing the Mid-term Measures

December 1996	Release Complete Survey Results
December - January 1997	Scoping Meetings with Industry
February 4, 1997	3rd Workshop on Proposed Standards
Late March 1997	4th Workshop on Proposed Standards
May 9, 1997	45-day Public Release of Proposed Regulation
June 26, 1997	Board Hearing

#### Enclosure

Inquiries about this meeting summary should be directed to Paul Milkey, Air Resources Board, at (916) 327-1517 or Lisa Kasper, Air Resources Board, at (916) 327-0648.

\*\*\*\*\*



## Enclosure

### Preliminary Prioritization of the Product Categories Included in the Mid-term Measures Survey

Product Categories we are Initially Focusing on for the  
Mid-term Measures:

Astringent/Toner	Multi-purpose Lubricant: Silicone-based
Automotive Rubbing or Polishing Compound	Non-selective Terrestrial Herbicide
Automotive Wax, Polish, Sealant or Glaze	Defoliant and Desiccant
Bug and Tar Remover*	Paint Remover or Stripper
Carpet and Upholstery Cleaner*	Penetrant
Floor Wax Stripper	Rubber and Vinyl Protectant*
General Purpose Degreaser	Selective Terrestrial Herbicide
Heavy-duty Hand Cleaner or Soap	Defoliant and Desiccant
Metal Polish/Cleanser	Spot Remover
Multi-purpose Dry Lubricant*	Spray Shine
Multi-purpose Lubricant*	Spray Undercoating
	Wasp and Hornet Spray

Grouping of the Product Categories:

- Bug and Tar Remover
  - Bug Remover
  - Bug and Tar Remover
  - Tar Remover
- Carpet and Upholstery Cleaner
  - Carpet Cleaner
  - Upholstery Cleaner
- Multi-purpose Dry Lubricant
  - Multi-purpose Lubricant: Graphite-based
  - Multi-purpose Lubricant: Moly-based
  - Multi-purpose Lubricant: Teflon-based
- Multi-purpose Lubricant
  - Chain, Cable or Open Gear Lubricant
  - Multi-purpose Lubricant
  - Multi-purpose Lubricant: Lithium-grease based
- Rubber and Vinyl Protectant
  - Rubber and Vinyl Protectant
  - Tire Cleaner/Dressing

Product Categories Requiring Further Study:

- Down-the-Drain Emission Factor Studies
  - Hand Dishwashing Detergent
  - Hand, Face or Body Cleaner or Soap
  - Laundry Detergent

Health Product Studies

Antimicrobial Hand, Body Cleaner or Soap  
Disinfectant  
Medicated Astringent/Toner

Reactivity Studies

Multi-purpose Solvent  
Paint Thinner  
Rubbing Alcohol

- \* Product categories that were grouped with similar product categories.